

PABST PATENT GROUP

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 24 2004

Pabst Patent Group LLP  
400 Colony Square, Suite  
1200  
1201 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30361  
Telephone (404) 879-2150  
Telefax (404) 879-2160  
information@pabstpatent.com  
www.pabstpatent.com

**TELEFAX**

Date: November 24, 2004

Total pages: 21 with fax  
cover

To: USPTO

Telephone:

Telefax: 703-872-9306

From: Patrea Pabst

Telephone: 404-879-2151

Telefax: 404-879-2160

Our Docket No. MIT 5261

Client/Matter No. 701350/48

Your Docket No.

Please call (404) 879-2150 if you did not receive all of the pages, or if they are illegible.

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This facsimile, along with any documents, files, or attachments, may contain information that is confidential, privileged, or otherwise exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of any information contained in or attached to this facsimile is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by facsimile or by telephone collect at the numbers stated above, and destroy the original facsimile and its attachments without reading, printing, or saving in any manner. Your cooperation is appreciated. Thank you.

**MESSAGE: RESEND WITH CORRECT SERIAL  
NUMBER ON FAX COVER SHEET  
(ORIGINALLY SENT Nov. 12, 2004)  
(We apologize for the error)**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Paul R. Schimmel

Serial No: 08,249,689

Art Unit: 1714

Filed: May 26, 1994

Examiner: J. Brusca

For: *DESIGNING COMPOUNDS SPECIFICALLY INHIBITING RIBONUCLEIC  
ACID FUNCTION*


(4505239.1)


PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0851-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b>	Application Number	08/249,689	
	Filing Date	May 26, 1994	
	First Named Inventor	Paul R. Schimmel	
	Art Unit	1631	
	Examiner Name	J. Brusca	
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Attorney Docket Number	MIT 5261
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		20	

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement  <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD  Remarks _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Response to Request for Reconsideration of Decision by Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
<b>SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT</b>		
Firm Name	Pabst Patent Group LLP	
Signature		
Printed name	Patricia L. Pabst	
Date	November 12, 2004	Reg. No. 31,284

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:		
Signature		
Typed or printed name	Chandra Russell	Date November 12, 2004

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

MIT 5261 701350/48

PTO/SB/17 (10-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0361-0032  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**FEE TRANSMITTAL**  
**for FY 2005**

Effective 10/01/2004, Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$ ) 0.00

**Complete if Known**

Application Number	08/249,689
Filing Date	May 26, 1994
First Named Inventor	Paul R. Schimmel
Examiner Name	J. Brusca
Art Unit	1631
Attorney Docket No.	MIT 5261

**METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)**☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money Order ☐ Other ☐ None☒ Deposit Account:Deposit  
Account  
Number  
Deposit  
Account  
Name

50-3129

Pabst Patent Group LLP

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☒ Credit any overpayments☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.**FEE CALCULATION****1. BASIC FILING FEE**

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001 790	2001 395	Utility filing fee	
1002 350	2002 175	Design filing fee	
1003 550	2003 275	Plant filing fee	
1004 790	2004 395	Reliance filing fee	
1005 160	2005 80	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) (\$)

**2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE**

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee from	Fee Paid
20	-20 = 0	X 0	0
3	-3** = 0	X 0	0
Multiple Dependent			

**Large Entity | Small Entity**

Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description
1202 18	2202 9	Claims in excess of 20
1201 86	2201 44	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203 300	2203 150	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204 86	2204 44	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1206 18	2206 9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) (\$ ) 0.00

\*\*or number previously paid, if greater. For Reissues, see above

**FEE CALCULATION (continued)****3. ADDITIONAL FEES**

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051 130	2051 65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052 50	2052 25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053 130	2053 130	Non-English specification	
1812 2,520	1812 2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
1804 920*	1804 920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805 1,840*	1805 1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251 110	2251 55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252 430	2252 215	Extension for reply within second month	
1253 980	2253 490	Extension for reply within third month	
1254 1,530	2254 765	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255 2,080	2255 1,040	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401 340	2401 170	Notice of Appeal	
1402 340	2402 170	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403 300	2403 150	Request for oral hearing	
1451 1,510	2451 1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452 110	2452 55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453 1,330	2453 665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501 1,370	2501 685	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502 480	2502 240	Design issue fee	
1503 660	2503 330	Plant issue fee	
1460 130	2460 130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807 50	2807 50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a)	
1808 180	2808 180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021 40	6021 40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809 790	2809 395	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810 790	2810 395	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801 790	2801 395	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802 900	2802 900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify)

\*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$ ) 0.00

**SUBMITTED BY**

Name (Print/Type)	Patricia L. Pabst	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	31,284	Telephones (404) 879-2151
Signature		Date	November 12, 2004	

**WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

MIT 5261 701350/48

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****NOV 24 2004****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appellant: Paul R. Schimmel                      Appeal No. 2003-1335 and 1997-2396

Serial No.: 08/249,689                      Art Unit: 1631

Filed: May 26, 1994                      Examiner: J. Brusca

For: *"DESIGNING COMPOUNDS SPECIFICALLY INHIBITING RIBONUCLEIC  
ACID FUNCTION"*

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Sirs:

Appellant requests the Board deny the request for reconsideration of the decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed October 30, 2003.

Please address all future correspondence to:

**Patrea L. Pabst  
PABST PATENT GROUP LLP  
400 Colony Square Suite 1200  
1201 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30361  
(404) 879-2151 (Telephone)  
(404) 879-2160 (Fax)**

It is believed that no fee is required. However, should a fee be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3129. A change of correspondence address has been filed.

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689  
FILED: May 26, 1994  
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

**I. Brief History of Appeals in this Application**

This application was originally filed May 26, 1994, claiming priority as a continuation to U.S.S.N. 07/586,534 filed September 21, 1990. The examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 as lacking enablement was originally appealed August 19, 1996. A decision in appeal 1997-2396, mailed on April 30, 2001, by the Board of Appeals reversed the rejection of the method and composition claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, finding the claims enabled, upheld the double patenting rejection over the related case, 07/929,834 filed August 14, 1992, issued September 3, 2002 as U.S. Patent No. 6,446,032, and made a new rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, written description. The Board's decision in appeal 1997-2396, held that, while the factors relied on by the examiner are relevant in determining enablement by the specification, they were insufficient to establish that the experimentation required to practice the claimed invention was undue. The examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 3 through 21 for lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, was reversed. Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.196(b), the Board entered a new ground of rejection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 on the basis that the specification failed to provide an adequate written description for composition claims 11 through 13, 17 through 19 and 21.

In response to the Board's decision dated April 30, 2001, Appellant amended base claim 11, and claims dependent thereon, to more clearly define the composition as a compound that is complementary to the target RNA sequence comprising hydrogen bond donor and acceptor sites.

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689  
FILED: May 26, 1994  
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Lines 29-17, bridging pages 38 and 39, for example, provide support for these amendments. A Terminal Disclaimer was also filed.

The examiner rejected the amended composition claims as lacking written description. Appellant submitted argument and factual and expert evidence. The examiner maintained the rejection. The examiner's final rejection of composition claims 11-13, 17-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, as lacking written description was appealed to the Board of Appeals on June 10, 2002. On October 30, 2003, the Board of Appeals affirmed the rejection in part and reversed in part and the case was returned to the examiner.

The method claims are allowable.

After numerous calls to the examiner, this request for reconsideration was issued.

## II. Basis for Request for Reconsideration

The alleged basis for the request for reconsideration is that there was an intervening decision by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 69 USPQ 1886 (Fed. Cir. 2004) that was not considered by the Board of Appeals in rendering its decision on October 30, 2003. The request also states that the Board's analogy to antibody-antigen binding is technically incorrect. The request mischaracterizes the claims (including the allowed method claims) and ignores the abundance of evidence and case law that the Board did take into consideration, not once but twice with this case on appeal.

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Although the Appellant would have preferred for the Board to have reversed the rejection of all claims, the Board did not fail to consider the evidence and to utilize the correct standard of law in making its decision. The Board as clearly done a far better job of reviewing the application, the record and the evidence than those requesting the Board now reverse its decision. These facts are briefly reviewed below along with an analysis of the legal standard for compliance with the written description requirement. A careful review of the decision in *University of Rochester* makes clear that the legal standard for written description was not altered by the Federal Circuit, but clarified as to application to the very specific set of facts in *University of Rochester*.

### III. Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 20 are pending and allowed.

Claim 11 was amended on December 24, 2003, to incorporate the language of claim 17, which was found to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 by the Board of Appeals in its decision issued October 30, 2003. Claims 13, 18, 19 and 21 depend from claim 11.

Claim 2, 12 and 17 have been cancelled.

The claims in issue are as follows:

11. A complementary compound comprising hydrogen bond donor and acceptor sites arranged to specifically bind and inhibit the function of a targeted RNA molecule, wherein the compound is specifically directed to and binds to a critical region within the minor groove of the

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

acceptor stem of a tRNA molecule, identified by a combination of the primary, secondary and tertiary structure of the critical region.

12. The complementary compound of claim 11 wherein the RNA is selected from the group consisting of mRNA, tRNA, rRNA, and viral RNA.

13. The complementary compound of claim 11 further comprising a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier selected from the group consisting of pharmaceutically acceptable compositions for topical administration, pharmaceutically acceptable compositions for parenteral administration, pharmaceutically acceptable compositions for enteral administration, and combinations thereof.

18. The complementary compound of claim 11 wherein the tRNA molecule is tRNA<sup>Ala</sup>.

19. The complementary compound of claim 11 wherein the critical region is the G3:U70 base pair.

21. The complementary compound of claim 11 wherein the compound is a nucleic acid and the compound is synthesized *in vivo* from a retroviral vector.

**IV. The Application and Evidence Comply with the Written Description Requirement**

The request for reconsideration is factually incorrect on two basis: (1) the claims define a composition with a specific structure and function based on its complementarity and binding to the acceptor stem of the minor groove of a tRNA molecule and (2) the claimed composition and its substrate is analogous to antibody-antigen binding. The request for reconsideration is also



U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

misleading in how it characterizes the claims in issue and fails to consider the supplemental evidence provided by the appellant.

Claim 11 defines "A **complementary compound comprising hydrogen bond donor and acceptor sites arranged to specifically bind and inhibit the function of a targeted RNA molecule, wherein the compound is specifically directed to and binds to a critical region within the minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecule, identified by a combination of the primary, secondary and tertiary structure of the critical region.**" (emphasis added)

The Board found this language to be supported by the application since "the structure of at least one of the two mutually dependent compounds, in this case, the RNA target molecules, is 'sufficiently known or disclosed'. That is, in claim 17, the target RNA is identified as the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecule; in claim 18 the target RNA is the tRNA<sup>Ala</sup> molecule; and in claim 19, the target is identified as the G3:U70 base pair of the tRNA<sup>Ala</sup> molecule. Thus, for the subject matter of these claims, a functional characteristic (binding and inhibition of target RNA) is coupled with 'a structure that is sufficiently known or disclosed' (a transfer RNA)". Decision at page 7.

As the Board correctly found, appellant demonstrated in the application as originally filed, that the primary, secondary and tertiary structure of the tRNA molecules were known, methods to make and screen for inhibitors were known; and inhibition of function through alteration of structure within the acceptor stem of a tRNA had been demonstrated as of the date this application was originally filed. See page 3, line 15 to page 4, line 4; Figures 1A, 2A, 2B, 3 and 4; page 8, lines 7-20 and line 23 to page 8, line 2; page

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

**12, line 11 to page 14, line 22; page 15, lines 5-24; pages 16-17 (screening method); pages 20-22; examples 1 and 3, describing not just the native tRNA molecules but a number of variants; example 6, describing an inhibitor for bacterial but not human tRNA with reference to Figures 3 and 4.**

The claims define compounds complementary to the minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecule. If anything, this is even more exact than the relationship between antibody and antigen, since antibodies have a variable region that differs depending upon the antigen that is bound by the antibody. In the case of the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecules, there is no variation. The primary, secondary and tertiary structures are all known. The claimed compounds are therefore defined by their complementarity to a specific portion of these known, well characterized molecules and by their function in inhibiting the tRNA molecules through binding to the minor groove.

The claims on appeal were drawn to a genus of compounds complementary to a targeted RNA molecule and inhibiting the function of the targeted RNA molecule. Following the decision, the claims were narrowed to those compounds complementary to the minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecules. The specification describes the structure of the claimed compounds by illustrating the chemical properties (hydrogen bond acceptor and donor sites arranged specifically) and method of preparation (first, determining the target RNA sequence and second, preparing the compounds accordingly) of the compounds, along with that of the minor groove of the acceptor stem of the tRNA molecules. These elements distinguish the

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

compounds based on the claimed interaction with a critical region in the minor groove of the target RNA. Although the compounds may be organic, inorganic, proteins, or even nucleic acids, specific binding is achieved through complementary interactions (page 38 of the specification, lines 24-31). These interactions are dependent upon hydrogen bonding (lines 29-17, bridging pages 38 and 39). Therefore, in order for the compound to bind to the target RNA, hydrogen bond donor sites, hydrogen bond acceptor sites, and chemical side groups, have to be in the correct spatial location, orientation, and have the correct charge. One of skill in the art would realize that it is this arrangement that defines the structure of the compound.

"Complementary" defines the structure of the compound. Complementary compounds are limited by the primary, secondary and tertiary structure of the RNA target molecule.

The importance of appellant's discovery cannot be underestimated: he discovered that RNA inhibitors must bind to their RNA target within the minor groove, and can be designed based on the secondary and tertiary structure of the RNA within this minor groove. This is the subject matter of the method claims that have been allowed. He provided the specific structure of the inhibitors of the minor groove of the acceptor stem of tRNA molecules by reference to the known structure of this site. Many others have since made RNA inhibitors that bind to the minor groove. Appellant previously submitted Declarations by two experts in the field to show that they considered the application complied with the written description requirement, and that one of routine skill would need nothing more than what is in the application to know that appellant had possession of the claimed genus at the time of filing. The Examiner never provided any

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689  
FILED: May 26, 1994  
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

rebuttal evidence, only argument in denying that those skilled in the art at the time this application was filed knew or could readily ascertain the structure of the claimed compounds, based on their complementarity to the minor groove of RNA molecules, using available computer software programs. What appellant discovered, and made available to the public, was the evidence that the inhibitor had to fit within the minor groove, bind by hydrogen bonds and have complementary structure to the RNA within the minor groove.

Two declarations under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 by Dr. Jules Rebek and Dr. James R. Williamson, respectively, were submitted with the response mailed on April 11, 2002. Both Dr. Rebek and Dr. Williamson are experts in the field. Neither have any financial interest in this application nor received any compensation for their declaration. Dr. Williamson provided his expert opinion as well as enclosed data in support of the claims. The declarations were submitted in order to provide further evidence that the description of the structure of the critical region in the minor groove of RNA is sufficient to describe the structure of the claimed compound. Each declaration clearly elaborates upon the present specification's discussion of the forces presented in and by the targeted RNA molecule. While these forces establish the structure of the critical region of the RNA in terms of specific and available interactions and geometry, they are a direct result of the RNA sequence (primary structure). Secondary and tertiary structures can subsequently be determined via any number of commercially available programs, as outlined in the submitted declarations.

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The analogy to a "lock and key", in the submitted declarations, is an important one because if one can conceptualize the role of the predetermined and defined target RNA in demanding a specific structure of the inhibitory compound, then one will realize that the compound structure is clearly defined. The target RNA is defined by those interactions and forces present in the minor groove of the critical region, as described in the specification, defined by the claims and further elaborated on by Drs. Jules Rebek and James R. Williamson. The statements that this is a situation totally unlike that of an antibody-antigen relationship is factually incorrect. The minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA has a known and defined primary, secondary and tertiary structure. This was known at the time the application was filed. The claimed compounds bind within this groove by virtue of the three dimensional structure that conforms to the shape of the minor groove and the chemical composition that creates hydrogen bonding at sites within the minor groove that are readily ascertainable. This is the exact same way an antigen is bound by the variable region of an antibody.

Dr. Rebek

Dr. Rebek is the Director of the Skaggs Institute of Chemical Biology and Professor of Chemistry of the Scripps Research Institute. Dr. Rebek is clearly an expert in the field of nucleic acid structure. Dr. Rebek has no personal or financial interest in this application. He was asked to review the specification and claims, in view of the legal standard for the written description under 35 U.S.C. §112, to determine if he, as one in the field, would know what the structure of the claimed compounds was, based on his knowledge, the specification, and the language of the

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

claims. Dr. Rebek specifically addressed the structure of the minor groove of the RNA in responding, reviewing the hydrophobic environment of the minor groove, hydrogen bonding, electrostatic interactions, and geometric and steric constraints. As summarized on page 7, "All of these 'constraints' define the nature of the inhibitory compound in terms of structure and functionality; they define the molecular recognition of the RNA by the compound where the compound is complementary in size, shape and chemical surface to the RNA."

Dr. Williamson

Dr. Williamson is a Professor of Molecular Biology and Chemistry at the Scripps Research Institute in La Jolla, CA. He is an expert in the field of RNA and drug design, including RNA structure, RNA-protein recognition, and RNA-small molecule interaction. As stated at the top of page 3, he presents "evidence indicating that attractive and repulsive forces present in the critical region of the minor groove of RNA dictate or define the geometrical constraints of the region. These forces, as described in the specification, and below, define the structure of the critical region in a way that provides one with a mental picture of a defined "space" that can only be accessed by a compound of the correct "shape". He also reviews each of the claimed structural features: the hydrophobic environment of the minor groove, the hydrogen bonding, the electrostatic interactions, and the geometric and steric constraints. Dr. Williamson refers to the precedent of compounds that bind to DNA molecules (recognizing that here, the invention is the discovery that the minor groove of RNA is the critical binding site, whereas in DNA it is the major groove), as published by Dervan, et al., in Science 232, 464-471

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

(1986). Dr. Williamson also provides evidence that the claimed method and compounds were enabled and clearly described in view of his own subsequent work, published in part by Sultan, et al., Science 288, 107-112 (2000) and as demonstrated by the attached figures.

This evidence clearly support appellant's position that the specification and claims to compounds binding to the minor groove of tRNA molecules and thereby inhibiting the tRNA function meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, written description. The examiner has never provided anything to rebut this evidence, merely unsupported argument.

**V. The Legal Standard for Compliance with Written Description Requirement**

The request for reconsideration is allegedly based on the assertion that the decision in this appeal would have been different had the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences had the decision by the Federal Circuit in *University of Rochester supra* been available to it. We disagree. The decision by the Board in this case, issued on October 30, 2003, is entirely consistent with the Federal Circuit's decision in *University of Rochester*, especially when the differences in the facts of the two cases are taken into consideration.

In *University of Rochester*, the District Court had found claims to a method of treatment and claims to compounds for use in the method of treatment invalid as lacking enablement and written description. Enablement is not in issue here. The original rejection of the method and compound claims as lacking enablement was reversed by the Board of Appeals in the decision rendered April 30, 2001. This rejection was not made again by the examiner, nor asserted in the

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689  
FILED: May 26, 1994  
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

request for reconsideration. One can therefore conclude that all parties are in agreement that one of ordinary skill in the art is able to practice the claimed method and make the claimed compounds, without undue experimentation, unlike in *University of Rochester*.

In *University of Rochester* at 920, the Federal Circuit reviewed the standard of the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112 and reiterated that the purpose of the written description requirement is separate from the enablement requirement, and "is to 'ensure that the scope of the right to exclude, as set forth in the claims, does not overreach the scope of the inventors' contribution to the field of art as described in the patent specification,' *Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1342 at 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "The 'written description' requirement serves a teaching function, as a 'quid pro quo' in which the public is given 'meaningful disclosure in exchange for being excluded from practicing the invention for a limited period of time', citing to *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956 at 970 (Fed. Cir. 2002). *University of Rochester* at 922.

This is another point in which the facts of the present case differ from *University of Rochester*. In the present case, the invention is the discovery that compounds complementary to the minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA molecule can be used to inhibit the activity of the tRNA. The primary, secondary and tertiary structure of the acceptor stem of tRNA molecules, including the minor groove, was known as of the original filing date. The structure of the claimed compounds is defined by this complementarity. The invention is not the structure of the minor groove of tRNA. This was known. The application contains evidence showing that



U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

substitution of even a single nucleotide, i.e., even an extremely small structural change, can inhibit the function of the tRNA molecule. The application and subsequently provided information by two experts in the field at the time this application was filed, establishes that one skilled in the art would have known what compounds could be made that would have been complementary to these known tRNA minor groove structures and would be able to predict their structure and form therefrom. Therefore, unlike in *University of Rochester*, where there was no definition of the structure of the claimed compounds, only a functional definition, the claimed compounds in this case are defined by structure and by function, and those skilled in the art have provided un rebutted evidence that they could be obtained and characterized without undue experimentation.

The Court in *University of Rochester* did not change its previous interpretation of the requirements for compliance with the written description requirement, reiterated shortly before in *Enzo supra*. The Board's attention is drawn in particular to the Court's statement in *University of Rochester* at 925, citing again to *Enzo* and stating "in fact, where there might be some basis for finding a written description requirement to be satisfied in a genetics case based on the *complementariness* of a nucleic acid and, for example, a protein, that correspondence might be less clear in a non-genetic situation. In *Enzo*, we explained that functional descriptions of genetic material can, in some cases, meet the written description requirement if those functional characteristics are 'coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.' 323 F.3d at 964 (quoting from the PTO's

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, P1 "Written Description" Requirement, 66 Fed. Reg. 1099, 1106)." (emphasis added).

In rebuttal to the statements in the Request for Reconsideration at page 3, the Federal Circuit also stated in *University of Rochester* at 926 "We of course do not mean to suggest that the written description requirement can be satisfied only by providing a description of an actual reduction to practice."

Also in contrast to *University of Rochester*, where the Court based part of its finding on the failure of Rochester to present evidence that the ordinary skilled artisan would be able to identify compounds based on a functional description, here the Appellant has provided objective evidence that even in the absence of the claimed limitations relating to complementarity to the minor groove of tRNA, one could identify compounds binding to the minor groove of RNA techniques and software available when this application was originally filed. No evidence was provided by the examiner to rebut this evidence, and there is no reference to it in the Request for Reconsideration.

## VI. Conclusion

The Request for Reconsideration should be denied. The Request mischaracterizes the claims and the underlying facts that were taken into consideration by the Board of Patent Appeals in rendering its decision on October 30, 2003. The Request also implies that the Federal Circuit has somehow changed the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, in the

U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

decision rendered in *University of Rochester*. The claims now pending in this application comply with the written description requirement for the same reasons under *University of Rochester* as they did in the decision rendered October 30, 2003: the claims define compounds complementary (including appropriate hydrogen and other chemical bonds and structure) to the minor groove of the acceptor stem of a tRNA (a structural definition) which are effective to inhibit the function of the tRNA molecules (a functional definition). The application as originally filed provides an abundance of information on the structure of the minor groove of tRNA molecules, evidence that even minor changes to this structure inhibits the function of the tRNA molecules, and methods for making and testing the claimed compounds. The claims to the methods are allowable. Unrebutted expert evidence has been submitted stating that those skilled in the art would know the structure of the claimed compounds based on the complementarity of the compounds to the minor groove of the RNA. Finally, the Federal Circuit confirmed in *University of Rochester* that in genetic cases it can be sufficient to define the compounds in terms of complementarity to genetic material.


U.S.S.N. 08/249,689

FILED: May 26, 1994

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
DECISION BY BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Accordingly, the Board of Appeals should deny the Request for Reconsideration and  
return the application to the examiner to be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrea L. Pabst  
Reg. No. 31,284

Date: November 12, 2004  
PABST PATENT GROUP LLP  
400 Colony Square, Suite 1200  
1201 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30361  
(404) 879-2151  
(404) 879-2160 (Fax)